

Organization _____ Bldg./Room _____
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450
If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days

Official Business
Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

RECEIVED

OCT 15 2012

O MAIL CENTER




02 1M \$00.45⁰⁰
000 42449 45 OCT 01 2012
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314

FOE




NIXIE 917 DE 1 00 10/06/12
RETURN TO SENDER
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED
UNABLE TO FORWARD
BC: 22313145050 *2077-03800-06-24

9255038394-000





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
ATTN: LOUIS C. CULLMAN
840 NEWPORT CENTER DR.
SUITE 700
NEW PORT CA 92660

MAILED

SEP 28 2012

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 6,310,036	:	
Issue Date: October 30, 2001	:	
Application No. 09/227,400	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: January 9, 1999	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.378(b)
Attorney Docket No. 17347-301	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed September 11, 2012, to accept an unavoidably delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is not signed by a registered patent attorney or agent of record. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34, the signature of Kathleen R. Terry appearing on the correspondence shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that she is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf she acts. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the petitioner herein; however, all future correspondence regarding this patent will be directed solely to the above-noted correspondence address of record.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

The patent issued October 30, 2001. The second maintenance fee could have been paid from October 30, 2008, through April 30, 2009, or with a surcharge during the period from May 1, 2009 through October 30, 2009. Since no payment was received, the patent expired at midnight October 30, 2009, for failure to timely submit the second maintenance fee.

A petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee under 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b) must be accompanied by (1) an adequate showing that the delay was unavoidable, since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent, (2) payment of the appropriate maintenance fee, unless previously submitted, and (3) payment of the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1).

This petition lacks item (1) above.

The Director may accept late payment of the maintenance fee if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable". 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1).

By a statement from Dr. Linda Shecterle, now president of Last Chance Tissue Adhesives, Inc. (LCTA), Dr. Shecterle states she was advised of the expiry of the patent in the latter part of 2011 by an unrelated third party. She argues, however, that the delay in payment of the maintenance fees was unavoidable because (1) the attorney of record failed to either pay the fee or notify LCTA that the fee was due and (2) that LCTA was not aware that a post-issuance fee was due.

It is initially pointed out that the Letters Patent contains a Maintenance Fee Notice that warns that the patent may be subject to maintenance fees if the application was filed on or after December 12, 1980. Accordingly, a reasonably prudent patentee would have inquired to see if his/her patent was subject to maintenance fees. Further, applicant is bound by the consequences of the actions or inactions of his duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representative. Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-34 (1962); Houston v. Ladner, 973 F.2d 1564, 1567, 23 USPQ2d 1910, 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1992); see also Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (D.N. Ind. 1987). The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3). Petitioner should note that a delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent rules or statute does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay.

Acceptance of late payment of a maintenance fee is considered under the same standard as that for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. § 133 because 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) uses the identical language, i.e. "unavoidable delay". Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-09, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988)). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the "reasonably prudent person" standard in determining if the delay in responding to an Office action was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887)(the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-515 (D.C. Cir. 1912); and Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141. In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

In determining whether a delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person. Ray, 55 F3d at 608-609, 34 USPQ2D at 1787. It is

incumbent upon the patent owner to implement steps to schedule and pay the fee, or obligate another to do so. See California Medical Products v. Technol. Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp 1219, 1259 (D. Del. 1995). That is, 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps in place to pay the maintenance fee.

The record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. In fact, the record indicates that no steps were taken by patentee to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. Since no steps were taken by patentee, 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee. In the absence of a showing that petitioner or anyone else was engaged in tracking the maintenance fee due dates, and that party had in fact been tracking the due dates with a reliable tracking system, such as would be used by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business, petitioner cannot reasonably show that the delay was unavoidable delay. In re Katrapat, 6 USPQ2d 1863, 1867-1868 (Comm'r Pat. 1988); California, supra.

Dr. Shecterle notes that the sole patentee "is elderly and in poor health". However, 37 CFR 1.378(b) is a validly promulgated regulation, which requires a showing of the steps in place to pay the fee. In the absence of a showing that any steps had been taken, then 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the payment. In other words, if no steps were taken by petitioner, then any other circumstance would be immaterial to the delay.

35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) does not require an affirmative finding that the delay was avoidable, but only an explanation as to why the petitioner has failed to carry his or her burden to establish that the delay was unavoidable. See Commissariat A. L'Energie Atomique v. Watson, 274 F.2d 594, 597, 124 USPQ 126, 128 (D.C. Cir. 1960)(35 U.S.C. § 133 does not require the Director to affirmatively find that the delay was avoidable, but only to explain why the applicant's petition was unavailing). Petitioner is reminded that it is the patentee's burden under the statutes and regulations to make a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in payment of a maintenance fee is unavoidable. See Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), *aff'd* 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)(table), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992); Ray v. Lehman, supra.

As 35 USC § 41(b) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some response to a specific action by the Office under 35 USC § 133, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence would have taken steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees. Ray, 55 F.3d at 609, 34 USPQ2d at 1788. That is, an adequate showing that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee at issue was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken by the responsible party to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fee for this patent. Id.

As the patentee at the time of expiration, it was incumbent on petitioner to have this patent docketed for payment of the maintenance fee in a reliable system as would be employed by a prudent and careful person with respect to his most important business, or

to have engaged another for that purpose. See California Medical Products v. Technol Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp. 1219, 1259 (D.Del. 1995).

Since petitioner has not shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in paying the maintenance fee was unavoidable, the petition cannot be granted.

Petitioner should note that since the petition was not granted, the maintenance fee and post expiration surcharge are refundable. See 37 CFR 1.378(e)

Any request for refund must include a copy of this decision and be mailed to Mail Stop 16, Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or faxed to the Customer Service Help Desk at (571) 273-6500.

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204.

/SDB/

Sherry D. Brinkley
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: KATHLEEN R. TERRY
10965 53RD AVENUE NORTH
PLYMOUTH, MN 55442